

# **District of Columbia Public Schools**

**Washington, D.C.**



## **Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and  
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

**Submitted to the  
U. S. Department of Education  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Washington, D.C. 20202**

**Original Submission: May 1, 2003  
Revised Submission: June 3, 2003**

## **Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook**

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

### **Transmittal Instructions**

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to [conapp@ed.gov](mailto:conapp@ed.gov).

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Ave., SW  
Room 3W300  
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400  
(202) 401-0113

## **PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems**

### **Instructions**

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

- F:** State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P:** State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W:** State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK  
**Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of  
 State Accountability Systems**

Status	State Accountability System Element	
Principle 1: All Schools		
P	1.1	Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> .
P	1.2	Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> .
P	1.3	Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> .
P	1.4	Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> .
P	1.5	Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> .
P	1.6	Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .
Principle 2: All Students		
P	2.1	The accountability system includes <i>all students</i>
P	2.2	The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year</i> .
P	2.3	The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> .
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations		
P	3.1	Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> .
P	3.2	Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress</i> .
P	3.2a	Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> .
P	3.2b	Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> .
P	3.2c	Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> .
Principle 4: Annual Decisions		
P	4.1	The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.

**STATUS Legend:**

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval

W – Working to formulate policy

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

**Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability**

P	5.1	The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups</i> .
P	5.2	The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups</i> .
P	5.3	The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities</i> .
P	5.4	The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students</i> .
P	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
P	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.

**Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments**

P	6.1	Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments</i> .
---	-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Principle 7: Additional Indicators**

P	7.1	Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools</i> .
P	7.2	Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools</i> .
P	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

**Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics**

P	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics</i> .
---	-----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability**

P	9.1	Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions</i> .
P	9.2	Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions</i> .
P	9.3	State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population</i> .

**Principle 10: Participation Rate**

P	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment.
P	10.2	Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools</i> .

**STATUS Legend:**

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval

W– Working to formulate policy



# State Accountability Plan

## Executive Summary

The State Accountability Plan details the proposed policies and procedures relating to the District of Columbia Public Schools State Education Agency (DCPS-SEA) Assessment and Accountability Policy. It includes the development, implementation and monitoring of a comprehensive accountability system for all public schools in the District of Columbia, including Public Charter Schools. All students are held to the same standards and will participate in a State assessment aligned to the State academic standards. Assessment data are made public to inform parents and community members about student achievement by school, Local Education Agency (LEA), and the SEA. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in academic achievement, as measured by the state assessment and additional academic indicators, is expected for all students at the school, district and state level. Where progress is not made for two consecutive years, a school, district or state will be identified as “in need of improvement.” The DCPS-SEA Accountability System fulfills all municipal and federal requirements and regulations associated with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

## Policy Format and Development

The proposed policy follows the format of the workbook required by the Department of Education for the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. As such it is organized around ten accountability “principles” as required by NCLB.

1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all schools and LEAs.
2. All public school students are included in the State Accountability System
3. The State definition of Adequate Yearly Progress is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and math by the 2013-2014 school year.
4. The State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.
5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.
6. The State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State’s academic assessment.
7. The State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public high schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public middle and elementary schools.
8. AYP is determined separately for reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.
9. The State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.
10. For a school to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

## CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

The proposed plan has been developed by a team of educators from the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS), the two District of Columbia Public Chartering Authorities, and several of the charter schools (LEAs). The development was facilitated and directed through the Office of Accountability with assistance from the Office of Federal Grants Programs. Additionally, expert guidance was provided by personnel from the Department of Education and the Education Commission for the States. A Technical Advisory Team of experts in statistics and measurement also assisted the State in the development of the plan.

The first draft of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook was submitted to the Department of Education on January 31, 2003. It provided the work plan and timelines for creating the State Accountability System. An external Peer Review was conducted by the Department of Education of the DCPS-SEA Accountability System on April 3, 2003. Utilizing the guidance provided in the peer review as a guide the Accountability Workbook will be revised and resubmitted on May 1, 2003. It will contain the State Accountability Policy with all required evidence and data.

The DCPS State Superintendent and School Board will approve the State Accountability Plan. Refinements to policies and procedures will be considered in the future and acted on as appropriate. Implementation at the SEA and LEA level will be through Superintendent Directive and Board Rule according to the approved Accountability Plan. The final page of this document details the potential proposed changes or additions to the current DCMR regulations relative to Assessment and Accountability.

**Principle 1: *A single statewide Accountability System applied to all schools and LEAs.***

The District of Columbia Board of Education, in its role as the State Education Agency (SEA), establishes a single Accountability System for all Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and public schools (including public charter schools and special education centers) within the District of Columbia. The Accountability System will assess student proficiency in the state academic content standards in mathematics and reading/language arts.

All public schools and LEAs, and the SEA, are required to increase the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in the required academic areas. All schools, LEAs, and the SEA, are required to achieve 100% proficiency by school year 2013-2014.

- Results on progress will be made public through annual student, school, district and state report cards.
- Public Charter Schools (PCS) in the District of Columbia are required to adhere to the same assessment and accountability system as other public schools in the state as outlined in the NCLB federal regulatory guidance. The accountability system will be implemented with the participation of the local Chartering Authorities according to SEA, District of Columbia, and federal ESEA regulations.
- AYP calculations will be available on or about August 1<sup>st</sup> each year to enable parents of students attending schools identified as ‘in need of improvement’ to choose to transfer to a “high performing school” or supplemental services may be offered.
- School and LEA recognitions and interventions will be based on the achievement of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

---

**Principle 2: *All public school students are included in the State Accountability System.***

All students attending a public school in the District of Columbia for the “full academic year” will be included in the State Accountability System.

- The accountability system includes students in general education, special education, special education centers, and students in non-public day and residential special education centers. The accountability system also includes students enrolled in public charter schools in the District of Columbia.
- A ‘full academic year’ shall be defined as enrollment in the same school from the official state October enrollment date to the first day of testing.
- For students attending more than one school within a LEA in an academic year, the students’ academic indicators will apply to the LEA and SEA but not to either school.



#### CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

- For students transferring between LEAs within the SEA in an academic year, the students' academic indicators will apply only to the SEA.
- All students will participate in the state assessment system. All students will take achievement tests aligned to state standards for their grade. The only exception will be for students in special education programs who have the "most significant cognitive disabilities." For the SEA, the number of exceptions cannot exceed 1.0 percent of the total SEA student population. This criterion also applies to LEAs exceptions where the LEA consists of only one school. Students with the "most significant cognitive disabilities" will be assessed in a manner consistent with the alternate state academic standards.
- Until additional alternative assessments are available and approved by the U.S. Department of Education, all other students with disabilities will participate in the grade level state standardized testing program. Testing accommodations for these students must be consistent with the accommodations provided in the students' daily educational setting, including assessment strategies used in the students' daily educational program.
- For students in "ungraded" programs, age and the mandated LEA school entry date will determine the testing grade level.
- Achievement scores for students placed in special education centers or non-public day and residential special education programs will be attributed to the student's referring or 'home' school for purposes of meeting AYP.
- Until additional alternative assessments are available and approved by the U.S. Department of Education, all limited English proficient (LEP) and non-English proficient (NEP) students will be included in the state assessment system. In SY 02-03 there was an exception for Level 4 NEP students, in subsequent years there will be no exceptions. (The Level 4 NEP students are those who are non-English proficient based on their Language Assessment Scale (LAS) score and entered the school, LEA, or SEA after the official October enrollment date of the current school year.)

***Principle 3: State definition of Adequate Yearly Progress is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, so that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and math by the 2013-2014 school year.***

All schools and LEAs in the District of Columbia are required to make Adequate Yearly Progress as defined by the SEA to result in continuous and substantial improvement for all students. Adequate Yearly Progress is expected of all schools and LEAs whether they receive federal dollars or not.

- The State Accountability System includes academic assessments in grades 3-11. For the purposes of the State Accountability System, schools are defined as elementary, secondary, or both elementary and secondary schools. The State will classify each public school according to the school's grade configuration.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

- For the purpose of accountability, school data will be reported for elementary, secondary, or both elementary and secondary grades. Schools that are classified as both elementary and secondary must achieve both the elementary and secondary criteria for AYP. In such cases, schools that fail to meet one or both criteria will be considering as failing to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).
  - Baseline “starting points” were determined using the procedure prescribed in No Child Left Behind. (The starting points represent the percentage of students in a school, LEA, or SEA that must score “proficient” or better on the State assessment to meet the initial AYP targets.)
  - The starting points represent the minimum percentage of students scoring at or above the “proficient” performance level on a state assessment in order for a school to be judged as achieving adequate yearly progress. The starting points for “elementary” schools are 30.3 percent for reading and 38.4 percent for mathematics. The starting points for “secondary” schools are 13.7 percent for reading and 19.8 percent for mathematics.
  - The SY 2001-2002 data will be used to calculate the baseline year or “starting point”.
  - Intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives were also set for elementary and secondary schools for reading and mathematics. In all cases, the intermediate goals are based on two-year intervals. Six equal interval increases in the targets will occur in the following school years: 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012, and 2014.
  - Until valid and reliable standard setting studies are conducted on the new criterion referenced assessments, “proficient” is defined as any score at or above the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile on the state assessments. (The 40<sup>th</sup> percentile is the lower limit of the 5<sup>th</sup> stanine.) The LEA will complete criterion-referenced tests by SY2004-2005, as required by the Title I Compliance Agreement.
  - As prescribed in NCLB, the starting targets, annual objectives, and intermediate goals apply to all students and subgroups. Subgroups performance will be reported for the following subgroups: major race/ethnicity categories; special education status; migrant; economically disadvantaged; English language learner; and gender.
  - If any of the subgroups (except the migrant and gender subgroups) fail to meet the annual objectives, the school, LEA, or SEA is considered to have failed to make ‘Adequate Yearly Progress.’ “Safe harbor” provisions for subgroups will be applied for subgroups as prescribed by NCLB.
  - According to the ‘Safe Harbor Provision’ a school will not be considered for improvement if the following conditions are met:
    - The percentage of students in each subgroup, including the total group, scoring below proficiency decreased by 10 percent compared to the previous year;
    - The subgroup progressed toward the standard on the additional indicators; and
    - They achieve 95% participation.
-

**Principle 4: *State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.***

**The SEA will make final AYP determinations on or about August 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. Schools will have the opportunity to appeal. Appeals can only be based on questions of the accuracy of the AYP calculations.**

- Schools and LEAs will be given five business days to appeal AYP determinations. Appeals must be based on the accuracy of the data used for determining whether or not a school has achieved AYP.
- 

**Principle 5: *All public schools, LEAs, and the SEA are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.***

**All schools and LEAs and the SEA are accountable to make Adequate Yearly Progress. In addition, each subgroup within the schools, LEAs, and SEA must make Adequate Yearly Progress. Subgroups defined in NCLB include: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and student with limited English proficiency. NCLB also defines the total group (e.g., school, LEA, or SEA) as a subgroup.**

- To protect the privacy of individual students, subgroup data will not be reported for any groups consisting of fewer than ten students. However, to ensure statistically reliable subgroup estimates, no subgroup data will be used for accountability for groups smaller than 25 students. (It is recognized that this criteria will prevent the reporting of subgroup data for a significant number of schools and LEAs.)
  - All students are to be included for accountability purposes when calculating the participation rate and the percentage of students who are academically “proficient.” For students who have the “most significant cognitive disabilities,” the State has developed alternative academic standards that are linked to the general standards in reading and mathematics.
- 

**Principle 6: *State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State’s academic assessment.***

**The District of Columbia defines AYP primarily on the basis of student achievement of proficient on the State assessment, Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition. An alternate assessment developed in collaboration with the University of Kentucky will be administered to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The percentage of students in the SEA taking the alternative assessment will not exceed one percent. This criterion also applies to LEAs except where LEAs consist on only one school.**

- The current state assessment is a norm-referenced test and will be replaced in 2005 with a criterion-referenced test as required by the SEA’s Compliance Agreement with the United States Department of Education.
- The academic assessments include four levels of proficiency:

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

- Below Basic
- Basic
- Proficient
- Advanced

- Academic assessments will be administered in grades 3-11.

---

**Principle 7:** *State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public high schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public middle and elementary schools.*

**DCPS will use graduation rates as the additional indicator that must be met for high schools to demonstrate AYP. Attendance rates will be used as the additional indicator for elementary and middle schools.**

- In order to provide the “safe harbor” provisions of NCLB, subgroups data for the graduation and attendance rates will be calculated and reported where sufficient group sizes are attained.
- As required by NCLB, graduation rate will be reported for all high schools, LEAs that include high schools, and the SEA. The graduation rate will be calculated by dividing the number of graduates by the sum of the number of graduates and dropouts for the four preceding years.
  - Adequate yearly progress, in relation to the graduation rate, will be based on the SEA average. The baseline SEA average will be calculated on the one-year data available for 2001-2002. A four-year SEA average will be calculated after SY 2004-2005. Schools above the state average are defined as achieving adequate yearly progress if their rate does not decline by two percentage points two consecutive years. To make AYP, schools below the state average rate must increase each year until they reach the SEA average.
  - Dropouts are defined based on the criterion established by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) and as reported in the Common Core of Data.
  - Because reliable dropout data are not available for all LEAs and many LEAs and schools (e.g., charter schools) have been open less than four years, a baseline graduation rate will be calculated for all high schools using the SY 2001-2002 data.
  - Dropout data will be phased in progressively as data are available with four-year data available for most schools and LEAs by SY 2004-2005. For new schools and LEAs, dropout rates will be phased in with full data reported after four years.
  - Graduation rate calculations will be one year behind the school year. Graduation rates will be reported by February of the subsequent school year.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

- Attendance will be calculated by dividing the total daily attendance over the full academic year by the total daily enrollment taken over the same period. Schools will be required to record and report both daily attendance and enrollment.
  - Schools with less than a 90% attendance rate must show annual improvement up to a target of 90% attendance in order to make Adequate Yearly Progress.
  - Any school, including those performing at or above the 90% target, which have a decline of 2% or more in attendance each year for two consecutive years will be considered 'in need of improvement' for this academic indicator.

---

**Principle 8:** *AYP is determined separately for reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.*

**DCPS will measure Adequate Yearly Progress separately for the subjects of reading/language arts and mathematics. Proficiency levels will be calculated for “elementary” and “secondary” schools.**

---

**Principle 9:** *State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.*

**DCPS will determine the validity and reliability of the State Assessment System based on consultation with test manufacturers and the State Technical Advisory Team.**

- A Technical Advisory Team will advise the state on measurement and psychometric issues.
- Commonly accepted psychometric practice concerning reliability and validity will be employed in relation to testing and evaluation issues.
- The SEA will regularly evaluate the impact of the State Accountability System. Particular attention will be focused on the impact of the system on subgroup achievement and schools that serve special education and LEP/NEP populations.

---

**Principle 10:** *For a school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that the school or LEA assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.*

**For the purpose of calculating the test participation rate, student enrollment will be counted in all schools and LEAs on or about March 1st of each school year. Participation will be calculated by dividing the number of test takers by the March enrollment.**

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK  
Current Accountability Policies and Proposed Changes

**The Board of Education sets policy for the SEA. Its policies are enacted through Rules that make up Title 5 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (DCMR). All citations listed below are from Chapters 22 and 23 of the DCMR. Where no relative regulation or policy exists one will be created and added to the Regulations. Specific implementation and system development will be made via Superintendent's Directive.**

**Chapter 22: Grades, Promotion and Graduation**

***2210-Graduation Rate***

This section will have to be created to accommodate the definition (Section 2210.1) and calculation of graduation rate (2210.2) according to the State Assessment System.

**Chapter 23: Curriculum and Testing**

***Section 2310-City-Wide Testing***

Revisions will be made to specifically delineate the Assessment System with specific regard to subgroup accountability, Charter school participation and the use of a single state test.

***Section 2311-Use of Test Results***

Revisions will be made regarding AYP designations and the accountability provisions relating specifically to subgroups. Parent choice will be included as other use of test results.

***Section 2312-Availability of Test Results***

Revisions will be made adding the use and dissemination of State, LEA and school report cards. Timelines and LEA responsibilities for implementation may also be added.

**Chapters and/or sections will have to be added for each of the following:**

- *Collaborative relationship and procedure development of Charter Schools and SEA for collection of data.*
- *Rewards and sanctions for schools relating to AYP designation.*
- *Additional academic indicator of attendance.*
- *SEA role in determining final policy, guidance and directives relating to Assessment and Accountability.*
- *Title V to be consistent with NCLB requirements.*

## **PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements**

### **Instructions**

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

**PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2).</li> </ul>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	



# CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

The DCPS Board of Education is the State Board of Education for the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) is the State Education Agency (SEA) for the District of Columbia. As such, it encompasses all public school programs, charter schools (LEAs), private schools that use federal funds, and special education programs managed by the Department of Mental Health. AYP decisions will be made for all schools and students.

The working definition of a 'school program' is defined using two criteria. First, the school program demonstrates a student membership verifiable in the official enrollment counts. Second, the school program is assigned a budget code and therefore is able to receive state and federal funds. Using these two criteria as benchmarks, there are currently 10 types of school programs in the DCPS-SEA. The number and grade-spans of school programs (as defined by the two criteria) is illustrated in the table below. All are held accountable to the same Accountability criteria.

Number and Type of School/Program	Grades Served
1. (108) Elementary Schools	Pre-K to 4, Pre-K to 5, Pre-K to 6, Pre-K to 8, 4 to 6
2. (11) Middle Schools	6 to 8, 5 to 8
3. (9) Junior High Schools	7 to 9
4. (16) Senior High Schools	9 to 12, 10 to 12, 9 to 11
5. (6) Education Centers	Pre-K to 9, Pre-K to 8
6. (2) School-Within-A-School Charter School	9 to 12
7. (3) Alternative Education Programs	6 to 8, 9 to 12, 8 to 12
8. (4) Citywide Special Education Schools	Pre-K to 12, K to 5, 9 to 12, 7 to 12
9. (5) Special Education Centers	7 to 9, 2 to 8, 7 to 12, 9 to 12
10. (36) Public Charter Schools	Pre-K to 12

\*Refer to the *School Program List with AYP Designation* in Appendix D for a detailed list of schools.

Additionally, there are 195 state tuition grants to non-public day or residential placement for special education students. Students placed in these special programs will be required, beginning SY '02-'03, to participate in the state assessment. Their scores will be included with their 'home' or 'referring' school program.

#1-#9 in the above chart refer to school programs within the DCPS LEA. Each Charter school, according to Charter School law (District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995) is considered its own LEA. A Local Education Agency (LEA) is defined as an educational unit with one administrative structure serving one or more schools.

See subpart B:31-2853.20(a)(1) at [www.Dcpubliccharter.com/legislation1.html](http://www.Dcpubliccharter.com/legislation1.html) for policy citation.

When examining schools from a fiscal perspective exclusively, the number of schools varies from the total presented above. For clarification, there are school programs that share funds for two distinct educational programs. For the purposes of Accountability, the school program may be considered a school. More specifically, in one school building there may be two programs incorporated uniquely and individually into the State Accountability System.

1.1 Continued:

The following numbers are produced using only the fiscal criteria for defining a school.

*Total number of schools receiving public funds from the State: 195*

- 36 Public Charter Schools
- 159 DCPS LEA Schools

*Total number of public schools: 189*

- Notes: 6 school programs share funding with the school it is housed with

*Total number of schools receiving Title I funds: 175*

*Total number of schools not receiving Title I funds: 20*

*Total number of LEAs: 37*

- 36 Public Charter School LEAs
- 1 DCPS LEA

*Total number of LEAs receiving Title I funds: 36*

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>All school programs will be included in the State Accountability System. However, the specific manner in which they will be included may differ according to the type of school program in operation.</p> <p>*Refer to the <i>School Program List with AYP Designation</i> in Appendix D for a detailed list of schools.</p> <p>Below is a short summary of how each type of school is expected to make AYP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elementary, Middle, Junior High, Senior High, School-Within-A-School Charter and Citywide Special Education Centers will all be considered a school and be held accountable for the achievement of all students and subgroups to meet the applicable proficiency levels, participation rates, and additional academic indicators.</li> <li>• Public Charter Schools are considered both schools and LEAs and will be held accountable for the achievement of all students and subgroups to meet the applicable proficiency levels, participation rates and additional academic indicators.</li> <li>• Alternative Education Programs, Special Education Centers and students in non-public day or residential placement for special education will have the student scores applied to the 'home' or 'referring' school as previously defined. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Note:</i> Students receive instruction at the Alternative Education Program for a varying length of time. The majority of their instruction remains at their 'home' school.</li> <li>➤ <i>Note:</i> Students attending Special Education Centers and non-public day or residential placements remain the responsibility of the 'home' or 'referring' school as the originator of their academic instruction.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Schools with only one or two grades tested, or with only one year of data, will be held accountable for the achievement of students at the applicable proficiency level, participation rates and academic indicator.</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>DCPS SEA has four achievement levels for AYP determination. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Advanced</li> <li>2. Proficient</li> <li>3. Basic</li> <li>4. Below Basic</li> </ol> <p>To make AYP schools must meet the required percentage of students achieving at the Proficient or Advanced levels, the required participation rates, as well as the additional academic indicators.</p> <p>These levels are expected to stay the same through 2013-2014. With the augmenting of the current assessment system and the transition to a new State Assessment, the specific definitions of each level will change. The new assessment is slated for completion in May 2004 in accordance with DCPS' Compliance Agreement with the U. S. Department of Education.</p> <p>*Refer to <i>New Test Development Timelines</i> in Appendix A for specific timelines for completion of revision and alignment of assessments and standards.</p> <p>The performance of all students is measured in terms of grade level, as there is no out of grade testing.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>DCPS SEA makes annual AYP determinations approximately 60 days prior to the beginning of the school year. Below is a short summary of the SEA Activities in the Accountability Timeline.</p> <p>*Refer to <i>DCPS Accountability Timeline</i> in Appendix B for a more detailed timeline demonstrating the SEA, LEA/District, School and Student participation at each phase of the Accountability process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>September:</b> Begin school year and implementation of Statewide System of Support</li> <li>• <b>October:</b> Collect and verify enrollment</li> <li>• <b>March:</b> Collect and verify enrollment</li> <li>• <b>April:</b> Coordinate and supervise State Assessment, collect and verify attendance for testing, calculate participation rate, prepare and distribute RFP for new/renewing State Supplemental Service Providers</li> <li>• <b>June:</b> Receive results from testing company for State Assessment, analyze data, disaggregate data by subgroup, validate scores</li> <li>• <b>July:</b> Make AYP determinations, notify schools and districts of AYP determinations, approve final Supplemental Service Providers list</li> <li>• <b>August:</b> Respond to appeals by schools/LEA's, disseminate state/district report cards, monitor Choice option by LEA</li> <li>• <b>Ongoing:</b> Monitoring of supplemental service provider will be ongoing.</li> </ul>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The Report Card is currently made available to the public via electronic transmission on the DCPS website. The District of Columbia Public Schools Academic Performance Database System serves as the draft format of the State Report Card (refer to Appendix D). The report card will also be available in school offices and libraries. The report card is available to be translated for LEP students and their families.</p> <p>The APDS draft of the State Report Card currently does not include achievement data disaggregated by migrant status, data for public charter schools, graduation rate data and information on highly qualified teachers. However, the development and implementation of a new database has facilitated the management of data related to teacher certification that is currently being collected and will be made available for the report card produced in August for SY '02-'03. Public Charter School data will be collected through the Chartering Authority reporting system upon enhancements/approval by the SEA.</p> <p>Listed below is a timeline for revision of the State Report Card and the participating SEA departments.</p>		
State Report Card Revision Activity	Participating SEA Department(s)	Completion Date
Develop revised format	Committee of Practitioners	May 2003
Develop and implement Communications Plan	Office of Communications and Public Instruction (OCPI)	June 2003
Final Draft including all required elements made available to the public	Office of Accountability, OCPI, Division Assistant Superintendents	August 2003
Final format fully implemented	ALL	August 2004
*Refer to Appendix D for further student data.		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?<sup>2</sup></p>	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set by the State;</li> <li>• Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and,</li> <li>• Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>	
<p>The Board of Education and its Board Rules govern the DCPS SEA. These are found in the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (DCMR). DCMR Chapters 5, 22 and 23 detail the current accountability system. Refer to the final page of the <i>State Accountability Plan</i> in Appendix B for the specific policy statements. On Wednesday, April 16 2003 the Board of Education, via unanimous consent, approved the State Accountability Plan to implement the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (refer to <i>Board of Education Action Sheet</i> in Appendix B). The Board Action represents the first step in policy ratification. The next is to approve specific policy statements for each aspect of the Accountability Plan and incorporate them into the appropriate existing DCMR chapters. As this Plan presents greater accountability and a more clearly defined relationship with Charter Schools, DCMR chapters will have to be created. Refer to Appendix B for a specific calendar and work-plan for final Board Rulemaking for Accountability.</p> <p>These Board Rules will govern all school programs within the DCPS SEA. They will work in concert with the DC Reform Act, which is the legislative authority for Public Charter Schools.</p> <p>Specific implementation at the SEA and LEA level will be accomplished, as needed, through Superintendent Directive.</p> <p>To the extent practical, public recognition through a ceremony and plaque presentation will be given to schools making AYP. Another reward will be greater local authority for decision-making. Sanctions are defined in the <i>School Improvement Process</i> in Appendix C for further detail.</p>	

<sup>2</sup> The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(40)].

**PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>The definitions of a school program as detailed in section 1.1 of this workbook incorporate every student in the DCPS SEA receiving instruction according to the DCPS Standards. Refer to the <i>DCPS-SEA Aggregated School List</i> in Appendix D for the specific numbers of students included in the State Accountability System. The State Accountability System includes students in general education, special education, special education centers, alternative education and non-public private day/residential placements.</p> <p>➤ <i>Note:</i> 64 children attend a Department of Health and Human Services Special Education Center and do not receive instruction according to the Standards. Therefore they are not assessed according to the State Assessment system, rather, by a different set of criteria. Alternative state standards have been developed in collaboration with the University of Kentucky and alternative assessments were administered to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in SY2003.</p> <p>All LEAs are required to use predetermined accommodations in order to ensure maximum participation of students who are English language learners (ELLs) and/or students with disabilities. <i>Approved Accommodations for Students with Disabilities</i> and <i>Standardized Academic Achievement Testing for Language Minority Students: Spring 2003 Interim Policy</i> in Appendix A detail the State approved accommodations.</p> <p>Until such time as an acceptable alternate assessment is developed and implemented in accordance with DCPS’ Compliance Agreement, students who do not participate in the State assessment will be classified as “not proficient” and will be included in the LEA and/or the school’s accountability report provided the students have been enrolled for at least one academic year (see section 2.2). LEAs or schools are required to schedule makeup-testing sessions for students who may be absent at the scheduled time of testing. Students that are not tested, including students who have not been enrolled for a full academic year, will be counted when calculating the participation rate.</p>	



CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>A ‘full academic year’ is defined as enrollment from the October enrollment date to the first day of testing. The official enrollment from October will be compared to the enrollment in March. The comparison will identify students in the assessed grades who have not been in attendance for the full academic year in order to report their scores at the LEA level. Refer to appendix D for <i>DCPS Official Membership</i>.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS
2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>As noted in response 2.2, if a student is enrolled in October and remains enrolled to the March enrollment date, he/she is determined to be enrolled for a full academic year. Therefore, the school is held accountable for their academic achievement. However, students do transfer and the following details how their scores will be applied for accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a student enrolls in more than one school within the same LEA, the student’s achievement scores will apply to the LEA and SEA.</li> <li>• If a student enrolls in more than one school in a different LEA, the student’s achievement will apply to the SEA.</li> </ul>	

**PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?	The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts <sup>3</sup> and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>*Refer to the charts <i>Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives</i> in Appendix B for the timeline for 100% of students to achieve proficiency or better by 2013-2014.</p> <p>100% of students in the DCPS-SEA are expected to achieve 'proficient' or better by 2013-2014 SY.</p>	

<sup>3</sup> If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

**CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK**

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?	<p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>For a school or LEA to make AYP each subgroup (whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and all major racial/ethnic groups) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives (to include the applicable additional academic indicator) AND have at least 95 % participation rate in state assessment. To fail to make AYP, a school or LEA and each subgroup must fail to make progress in the same subject for two consecutive years.</p> <p>However, if any school or LEA meets ALL of the following, they will make AYP under the 'Safe Harbor Provision':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 95% participation rate on state assessment</li> <li>• % of students in each subgroup scoring below proficiency decreased by 10%</li> <li>• Subgroup showed improvement on the additional academic indicator</li> </ul>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS									
3.2a What is the State’s starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?	<p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State’s proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of the State’s total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...).</p>									
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS										
<p>The SEA measures achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP. Data is combined across grades for determining AYP. The following details the grade-spans included for the two levels of AYP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Elementary (to include Middle and Junior High): Grades 3-8</li><li>• Secondary: Grades 9-12</li></ul> <p>The chart below details the ‘starting points’ in terms of percent proficient or above for each of the grade-spans and content areas:</p> <table><tr><th>Grade Levels</th><th>ELA/Reading</th><th>Math</th></tr><tr><td>Elementary</td><td>30.3</td><td>38.4</td></tr><tr><td>Secondary</td><td>13.7</td><td>19.8</td></tr></table> <p>The starting points were calculated using the percent proficient in the school enrolling the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of students of the State’s total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level. This method was applied to all schools in the Elementary and Secondary grade-spans.</p> <p>The starting points were calculated using data from the ’01-’02 school year. The starting points are the same for all schools in the Elementary Grade-span and in the Secondary Grade-span. Schools with ungraded or age-based groupings were identified according to the closest grade that would apply. As the new tests are introduced, adjustments will be made as needed and sent to the USDE as part of the DCPS plan.</p>		Grade Levels	ELA/Reading	Math	Elementary	30.3	38.4	Secondary	13.7	19.8
Grade Levels	ELA/Reading	Math								
Elementary	30.3	38.4								
Secondary	13.7	19.8								

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>The annual measurable objectives apply to all schools.</p> <p><i>*Refer to the charts Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives in Appendix B for the Annual Measurable Objectives.</i></p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year.</li> <li>•Each following incremental increase occurs within three years.</li> </ul>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>Intermediate goals first increases for the 2003-2004 SY. Each subsequent increase occurs every two years and is equal incrementally from 2001-2014.</p> <p><i>*Refer to the charts Elementary/Secondary Starting Points, Intermediate Goals and Annual Measurable Objectives in Appendix B for the Intermediate Goals.</i></p>	

**PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. <sup>4</sup>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
AYP decisions are made annually according to the Accountability Timeline as detailed in Appendix B. Decisions are made for each school.	

<sup>4</sup> Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

**PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?</p>	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>
<p><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>	
<p>For a school or LEA to make AYP, each subgroup (whole school, students with disabilities, NEP/LEP, economically disadvantaged, and from all major racial/ethnic groups) must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives (to include the applicable additional academic indicator) AND have at least 95 % participation rate in state assessment.</p> <p>Students with disabilities will be identified by their IEP and verified through the Special Education Tracking System.</p> <p>Economically disadvantaged students will be identified through their application for free/reduced lunch.</p> <p>Major racial and ethnic groups, which include: African-American/Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, White and other will be identified through the official enrollment.</p> <p>NEP/LEP students will be identified and serviced through the Office of Bilingual Education.</p> <p>In addition, “not proficient” will be assigned to students who have attended a full year of school but are unable to meaningfully participate in the state assessment. This policy will continue until such time as the alternate assessment, which is being developed as a part of the Compliance Agreement between DCPS and the Department of Education, is available. Refer to Appendix A for documents relating to development of alternate assessments.</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
All LEAs will be held accountable for student subgroup achievement. In order to make AYP each subgroup must meet or exceed the annual measurable objectives, intermediate goals, participation rate and other indicators. Those subgroups will include the economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students. LEAs are required to collect and report all required data to allow the State to disaggregate data consistent with the regulations of NCLB. Additionally, the SEA will require School Improvement Plans to specifically describe how the academic needs of major subgroups will be met.	



CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p><b>5.3</b> How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>
<p><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>	
<p>Refer to Appendix E, <i>Impact Study: Accountability Policy</i> for specific numbers of students with disabilities participating in the State Assessment. All students with disabilities participate in the statewide assessment with accommodations as appropriate. The State Assessment is incorporated as a deliverable in the contract with non-public private day/residential placement programs to ensure that all students receive the same, high quality, standards based instruction (see <i>Contract</i> in Appendix E).</p> <p>Students with disabilities who are not involved in the general education curriculum, will be designated "not proficient" until such time as the alternate assessment is completed and implemented in November 2004 in accordance with the State's Compliance Agreement.</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<b>5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of AYP?</b>	<p>All LEP students participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>All students with limited English proficiency will be included in the State's definition of AYP. The majority of LEP students will participate in the general assessment with accommodations. Students who have had less than one academic year of instruction in English and are scoring Non English Proficient (NEP) on the English language proficiency test will be deemed "not participating" until such time as the alternate assessment instrument for English language learners is completed. The alternate assessment is being developed in accordance with the DCPS Compliance Agreement with the USDOE. This year NEP students were not tested, but all students will be tested in subsequent years.</p> <p>Following the implementation of the alternate assessment tool in the spring of 2004, students who are identified as non English proficient on the English language proficiency test and who have had less than two years of instruction in English at the elementary level (Grades 1-6) and less than three years of instruction on the secondary level (Grades 7-12) will be assessed with the alternate assessment tool. Students may participate in both assessments whenever it is meaningful for them to do so. Consideration will be given to the appropriateness of administering assessments in the Spanish language, the only other language in which a limited number of English language learners receive instruction, during the first three years of their enrollment in a U.S. school.</p> <p><i>Standardized Academic Achievement Testing for Language Minority Students: Spring 2003 Interim Policy</i> in Appendix A details the State approved NEP/LEP accommodations and inclusion policy.</p>	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK**

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>						
5.3 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.<sup>5</sup></p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>						
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>							
<p>The following table details the minimum number of students for reporting and accountability.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Minimum-N</b></th><th><b>Number</b></th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>For reporting (privacy)</td><td>10 (for a group larger than 10, DCPS will create a strategy to mask the identity of the students)</td></tr> <tr> <td>For AYP determination (reliability)</td><td>25 (academic indicators) and 40 (for participation rate)</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Refer to Appendix E for minimum group size impact analysis.</p>		<b>Minimum-N</b>	<b>Number</b>	For reporting (privacy)	10 (for a group larger than 10, DCPS will create a strategy to mask the identity of the students)	For AYP determination (reliability)	25 (academic indicators) and 40 (for participation rate)
<b>Minimum-N</b>	<b>Number</b>						
For reporting (privacy)	10 (for a group larger than 10, DCPS will create a strategy to mask the identity of the students)						
For AYP determination (reliability)	25 (academic indicators) and 40 (for participation rate)						

<b>CRITICAL ELEMENT</b>	<b>EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	<p>Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information.<sup>6</sup></p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>State assessment policies and procedures will not reveal personally identifiable information on students. This confidentiality is assured by the policy of not reporting results for groups of less than 10.</p>	

<sup>5</sup> The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

<sup>6</sup> The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student's parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student's education record.

**PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State's academic assessments.**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS																																
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments. <sup>7</sup>  Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.																																
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS																																	
The following table shows the assessment currently in use for the 2002-2003 AYP decision by grades. The test is the SAT-9.																																	
	<table><tr><th colspan="8">Grade Level</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>3</th><th>4</th><th>5</th><th>6</th><th>7</th><th>8</th><th>9-12</th></tr><tr><td>ELA/R</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td></tr><tr><td>Math</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td><td>NRT</td></tr></table>	Grade Level									3	4	5	6	7	8	9-12	ELA/R	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	Math	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT
Grade Level																																	
	3	4	5	6	7	8	9-12																										
ELA/R	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT																										
Math	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT	NRT																										
AYP is calculated based on the State Assessment Test and demonstrated improvement on one additional academic indicator. Students must achieve a proficiency level of at least the 40 <sup>th</sup> percentile to be considered proficient for the purposes of calculating AYP. CRT will be introduced in 2004-05 as stated in the Compliance Agreement.																																	

<sup>7</sup> State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

**PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?</p>	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,</li> <li>• Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and</li> <li>• Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer.</li> </ul> <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause<sup>8</sup> to make AYP.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>Graduation will be the additional academic indicator for Secondary AYP. The graduation rate is defined as the total number of graduates for a given year with a regular diploma divided by the sum of the number of graduates (for that year) and dropouts for the four preceding years. Refer to <i>Additional Academic Indicators</i> in Appendix A for further clarification. The definition of diploma excludes a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards.</p> <p>All LEAs and schools are accountable for reporting graduates and dropouts. AYP for graduation will be based on the SEA average. The baseline SEA average will be calculated on the one-year data available for 2001-2002 and will be provided to the USDE as it becomes available. A four-year SEA average will be calculated after SY 2004-2005. Graduation rates will be one year behind the school year. Graduation rates will be reported by February of the subsequent school year.</p> <p>These graduation rates will be reported in the aggregate for AYP and disaggregated for use when applying the 'Safe Harbor' provision.</p> <p>Dropouts are defined based on the criterion established by the National Center for Educational Statistics and as reported in the Common Core of Data.</p>	

<sup>8</sup> See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.<sup>9</sup></p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>Attendance will be the additional academic indicator for Elementary AYP. Attendance will be calculated by dividing the total daily attendance over the full academic year by the total daily enrollment taken over the same period. Refer to <i>Additional Academic Indicators</i> in Appendix A for further clarification. Schools will be required to record and report both daily attendance and enrollment.</p> <p>To make the attendance AYP indicator, a school must meet the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A school with less than 90% attendance must show annual improvement up to a target of 90% attendance</li> <li>• Any school, including those performing at or above the 90% target, which demonstrate a 2% decline or more in attendance each year for two consecutive years will not make AYP for this indicator</li> </ul>	

<sup>9</sup> NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

**CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	<p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) uses an automated student information system that requires schools to take attendance daily. The District of Columbia Board of Education Charter Schools and the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) are collaborating to implement systems that will permit the state to monitor and report state level data. The DCPS Office of Information Technology (OIT) is able to provide daily and periodic extracts and summary reports. Currently, the District of Columbia Public Charter Authority schools are required to report monthly attendance; they are currently studying more efficient ways to gather and transmit attendance data. Appropriate data collection strategies and quality control measures are being applied to the graduation rate data to ensure graduation rate data is valid and reliable.</p>	

**PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.<sup>10</sup></p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>The State AYP determination for all students will separately measure reading/language arts and mathematics in the aggregate and for each identified sub-group.</p>	

<sup>10</sup> If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

**PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?</p>	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>
<p><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p>	
<p>Refer to Appendix F for reliability of the State Assessment.</p> <p>The validity and reliability of the District of Columbia accountability system incorporates three components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Test reliability and validity</li> <li>➤ Reliability of disaggregated data</li> <li>➤ Quality control systems</li> </ul> <p>The reliability and validity of the state assessments are documented in Appendix F.</p> <p>The reliability of the disaggregated data is discussed in Principle 10.1.</p> <p>Quality control issues are primarily concerned with the development of state data collection, maintenance and reporting systems. The DCPS is working closely with the public chartering authorities and city agencies to establish quality control systems. The SEA will report annually on the status of these systems.</p>	



CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
<p>In order to ensure valid AYP determinations, the State has established an appeal process for all LEAs to appeal an accountability decision. The appeals process is based on the data and it's interpretation and will be initiated by the school, district or a significant group of parents at a particular school. <i>School Improvement Appeals Process</i> in Appendix C details the processes and procedures relating to appeals.</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.<sup>11</sup></p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>
<p><b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b></p> <p>Refer to Appendix A for the Standards and Test Development information.</p> <p>As new and developing school programs meet the two criteria (membership, budget code) they will be incorporated into the Accountability System.</p> <p>Annually the Accountability System will be reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee and the Adequate Yearly Progress Committee and to ensure reliability. Refer to Appendix B for Committee Membership</p>	

<sup>11</sup> Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

**PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.**

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>The State Accountability System will hold LEAs accountable for reaching the 95% participation rate for assessment. The State will use the total school enrollment and attendance for testing in calculating the 95% rate of participation, both in the aggregate and by subgroup. A zero score is assigned to non-participants, thus ensuring 95% participation and giving LEAs and schools strong motivation to encourage maximum participation. For the purpose of calculating the test participation rate, student enrollment will be counted in all schools and LEAs on or about March 1<sup>st</sup> of each school year. Participation will be calculated by dividing the number of test takers by the March enrollment.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	<p>State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.</p>
<b>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</b>	
<p>The State Accountability System will ensure that the 95% participation requirement will be applied when the group being assessed is statistically significant according to State definitions and regulations.</p>	